



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,784	06/25/2001	Emanuel Beer	10732-0009-999	1504

32588 7590 08/05/2003

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.
2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

MOORE, KARLA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS13

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/891,784

Applicant(s)

BEER ET AL.

Examiner

Karla Moore

Art Unit

1763

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
 2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 4. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 22 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
 7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 22.

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,5-9 and 11-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 11.
 10. ☐ Other: _____

Primary Examiner
 AU 1763
 J. Hamonjodh

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that both Sato and McGrath focus on separate and distinct problems from each other and the claimed invention. Examiner disagrees. Each of the references cited and the claimed invention are concerned with isolation of a processing environment. McGrath does infact address heat transfer through a chamber structure. The baffle gate chambers, similar to the thermally isolating interface of the claimed invention are provided to isolate the heat in a firing chamber from an environment outside the firing chamber. As noted in the previous office action, the gate valve of Sato functions as a thermally isolating interface, most effectively when closed. However, the interface does not include all of the recitations of the Applicant's claims. McGrath was cited in addition to Sato to remedy these deficiencies. The combination of Sato and McGrath form the basis for the rejections in the previous office action. Applicant has attempted to attack each of the referenes individually by arguing that McGrath would not be capable of maintaining two adjacent environments at separate pressures, however, McGrath is not relied upon for this teaching. Sato is constructed for maintaining environments at two pressures. Likewise, Sato is supplemented with the teachings of McGrath because McGrath provides additional teachings regarding temperature isolation which are not found in Sato. With regards to Applicant's argument that McGrath does not disclose two chambers coupled to two sides of an isolation apparatus, Examiner again points out that McGrath is not relied upon for this teaching. McGrath is relied upon for a specific teaching of thermally isolating two separate environments within a system. Sato is relied upon for teaching the physical connectivity of those two environments and other environments within the system .